DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 172 276 CS 502 523

AUTHOR Ritter, Kurt W.
TITLE Significant Form and Rhetorical Criticism: The Jeremiad and the Rhetoric of the American Revolution.
PUB DATE Apr 79
NOTE 16p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Central States Speech Association (St. Louis, Missouri, April 5-7, 1979)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Christianity; Persuasive Discourse; Political Attitudes; *Political Influences; *Puritans; Religious Factors; *Revolutionary War (United States); *Rhetoric; Rhetorical Criticism; *United States History

ABSTRACT

The jeremiad, a sermonic rhetorical form, played a significant role in the American Revolution. As a successful social movement, the Revolution generated a language that portrayed its interpretation of reality. This was achieved in part through the use of significant forms that served to provide a link between the past and future and to foster a sense of community. The Puritan jeremiad was a four-part discourse that, after a reading from an Old Testament prophet, included the following: recognition of the people's failure to keep the divine covenant; interpretation of present evils as divine punishment; a call to recognize errors, repent, and restore the covenant; and a prediction of divine restoration of the people. The jeremiad became a vehicle of cultural expression and an agent of socialization, serving as rhetoric, ideology, and ritual. The rhetorical form of the jeremiad has subsequently taken on a secular cast, recognizing a covenant with the United States' past, rather than with God; civil religion has replaced Puritanism as the underpinning of the jeremiad. By analysis of this structure, speakers can be identified who were at the advancing edge of the movement, stressing action while their contemporaries were lamenting. (DF)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

Presented at the Central States Speech Association Convention,
St. Louis, April 5-7, 1979.

SIGNIFICANT FORM AND RHETORICAL CRITICISM:

THE JEREMIAD AND THE RHETORIC OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Kurt W. Ritter

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Kurt W. Ritter

ED172276

CS502523

It is with some hesitation that I venture to address you upon the topic of significant form as a perspective for the rhetorical study of movements, for the two key concepts to be discussed lack clear definitions--or, at least, as a group of scholars rhetorical critics do not widely agree on their definitions. The notion of the "rhetoric of a movement" has been with us for sometime--certainly since 1952 when Leland Griffin's seminal essay on "The Rhetoric of Historical Movements" appeared.[1] Nevertheless, we have not always been in agreement as to whether we are studying historical movements, social movements[2], innovational movements,[3] or rhetorical movements.[4] Further, specialists in the rhetoric of the women's movement and the rhetoric of the black power movement might well assert that a common method of criticism could not be profitably applied to both bodies of discourse.

The term "significant form" is no less problematic. In announcing the Conference on Significant Form in Rhetorical Criticism (which was sponsored by the Research Board of the Speech Communication Association and the University of Kansas) significant form was defined as "recurring patterns in discourse or action including among others, the repeated use of images, metaphors, arguments, structural arrangements, [and] configurations of language."[5] It is difficult to imagine a more vague definition. This problem has aroused the skepticism of some rhetorical scholars, not the least of whom is my friend and colleague John Patton--the chairperson of our panel. Professor Patton has been bold enough to observe in the Rhetoric

Society Quarterly that much "genre criticism" consists of little more than "a convenient means for grouping and classifying rhetorical acts." To the extent that he is correct in this assessment, then the concept of "significant form" or "genre" in rhetorical criticism may offer us little more than "typology at an inflated price."[6] As reflective criticism on significant form proceeds, however, there is reason to hope that it can offer more than a list of categories. For the moment, though, we must concede that the definitional problems which Professor Thomas Conley stressed in his powerful critique of the genre approach in a recent issue of Communication Quarterly have not yet been resolved.[7] The most recent major work on the genre approach to which we may turn for guidance is the Speech Communication Association's volume, Form and Genre: Shaping Rhetorical Action. Campbell and Jamieson, who edited this book, speak of a genre as a situationally-based "group of acts unified by a constellation of forms."[8] This definition implies that a "significant form" is a smaller component of a "genre", just as Henry Nash Smith and other American studies scholars have discussed symbol and myth as smaller and larger aspects of the same concept.[9] Elsewhere, however, the terms "significant form" and "genre" are used interchangeably, almost as if they are the same thing.[10] Surely, we must agree with Ernest Bormann's assessment that despite the promise of genre criticism, it is, "as yet, relatively unformed and unstructured."[11]

All of this difficulty with definitions calls to mind the remark of Supreme Court Justice Potter Stewart about a pornography case. He first confessed that he could not define obscenity, and then exclaimed: "But I know it when I see it!" Having recognized the definitional problems with "movement" and "significant form," I would like to posit for the purposes of this paper that we can label some large bodies of discourse as the rhetoric of movements; that we can distinguish some recurring forms in rhetoric as significant forms;

and that even if we cannot precisely define them, we can know them when we see (or hear) them.

In my discussion today I am concerned with one particular social and political movement (the American Revolution), and with one particular rhetorical form (the jeremiad). The jeremiad, of course originated as a pattern of organization for medieval sermons. The Puritans brought the jeremiad to America and transformed it to their own purposes just as they sought to transform their new land from a wilderness to a New Jerusalem. My purpose is to argue rather generally that the structure of the jeremiad provides a framework for charting the evolving rhetoric of the American Revolution and to suggest that the jeremiad or other significant forms may serve a similar purpose in the study of the rhetoric of other social movements. Given the preliminary nature of my own thinking on this thesis and the constraints of time, my discussion is necessarily speculative--but I hope that it is not unproductive. I would like to organize my remarks around three topics: first, the relationship of significant form to the rhetoric of movements; second, a description of the jeremiad as a significant rhetorical form; and third, an illustration of how the jeremiad can serve as an organizing principle for the rhetorical study of the American Revolution.

I

The notion of significant form arises naturally from a consideration of the rhetoric of movement, because if a movement is to be successful it must generate a language which portrays its interpretation of reality. As Charles Stewart has noted, "for a social movement to come into existence, to grow, and to survive, its leaders must alter perceptions of 'reality' of a significant number of people."[12] This is achieved, in part, through the use of rhetorical forms which help to establish a group myth and a sense

of community among those attracted to the movement.[13] To the extent that a movement can be characterized by its rhetoric, then its significant forms can provide a means of charting the movement's birth and development, its rise to prominence, and its eventual decline. As Campbell and Jamieson have pointed out, movement studies have the potential for illustrating "the development, fruition, and degeneration of rhetorical forms and strategies."[14]

Moreover, the rhetorical critic of movements might follow the evolution of significant forms as they are appropriated by succeeding movements, adapted and altered to new circumstances, and ultimately passed on to yet another movement. This sort of "rhetorical legacy" of movements, of course, is not a new concept. In his study of the British Chartist Movement of the nineteenth century, James Andrews argues persuasively that any movement leaves behind it "a rhetorical legacy: the strategies that it employed, the values it embodied, the heroes and villains that it created, form some part of this historical-cultural heritage and may prove an important source of invention for future spokesmen, future causes."[15] Part of a movement's legacy are its significant forms--rhetorical patterns that it passes on to later movements. This raises the possibility of searching out the evolving rhetorical forms of a culture as they are revealed in a series of movements. Ernest Bormann recently called attention to this prospect in one of his essays in the volume Form and Genre. He argues that "scholars studying communication and rhetoric very much need to have the history of persuasion in the United States charted in detail and surveyed in a way which provides a structured account of our historical symbolic experience. The history of significant rhetorical forms," Bormann suggests, "would be a major contribution to the field." Such a program of scholarship, he points out, would supplement present studies of "the history of public persuasion" which have been largely "of a topical nature and consist of documenting important speeches and speakers."[16]

Critics who appreciate the dynamic quality of rhetorical forms, Bormann suggests, ought to look for "those breaking points, crises, and transitions from one form to another."[17] Similarly, such critics could reveal how a form is altered to better serve the rhetorical needs of the culture. While this task may appear enormously ambitious, it is already well underway with the peculiarly American rhetorical form that has come to be called the jeremiad. Perhaps we ought to be a bit embarrassed that the majority of this research is not being conducted by rhetorical critics in speech communication, but by our brethern in Departments of English. In fact, speech communication studies on the jeremiad seem to be inadequately informed by the most important recent scholarship on the jeremiad as an evolving rhetorical form.

II

At the risk of seriously oversimplifying a sometimes subtle rhetorical form, we can characterize the American jeremiad by its origin as a type of sermon in which the Puritan minister exhorted the people to "get right with God." Typically beginning with a Biblical text from one of the Old Testament prophets, especially from the Book of Jeremiah or Isaiah, the Puritan preacher set forth a four-part discourse. In its simplest form, the jeremiad first noted that the people had sinned; they had failed to keep their covenant with God in faith or in deed. Second, the minister would reveal how the warnings of Isaiah or Jeremiah were fulfilling in the present day by pointing to the evils that God was visiting upon His people as punishment. Third, the people were called upon to realize their errors and to repent--to restore their part of the covenant with God--to return to the true principles of the church. Finally, the sermon would predict the lifting of God's punishment, the fulfillment of God's promise to His people; in short, the restoration of progress for the people under special and divine protection.[18]

The history of the jeremiad in America has primarily been the work of literary critics whose interest is in American culture. Critical attention to the jeremiad first occurred with Perry Miller's important series of studies on the New England mind.[19] As one recent critic has noted, "Miller's brilliant work on the jeremiad is the point of departure for all subsequent study of the form."[20] Miller discovered not an entirely stale and static formula, but a rhetorical form which was flexible enough to allow the Puritans to redefine their identity once it became clear that their's was a permanent errand into the wilderness. Miller, however, took a rather narrow view of the jeremiad. It was left to subsequent scholars to discover the recurrent pattern of the jeremiad in American rhetoric from the Great Migration of the Puritans to the Civil War and beyond. Miller's works have been followed by a series of essays, monographs and books which have illustrated the jeremiadic pattern of the rhetoric of King Philip's War (1675-1676),[21] the French-Indian Wars,[22] the American Revolution,[23] the War of 1812,[24] and the Civil War.[25] Other studies have attempted to trace the jeremiad in popular historical writings of the turn-of-the-century (the twentieth century, that is),[26] and in contemporary political rhetoric, especially recent presidential campaign speeches.[27]

Unquestionably, the foremost scholar of the jeremiad is Sacvan Bercovitch, a professor of English and Comparative Literature at Columbia University. Bercovitch is a specialist in early American literature who takes rhetoric seriously. Nine years ago (in 1970) the University of Wisconsin published a major study of over 150 pages by Bercovitch on the "Rhetoric of the Jeremiad" as part of its Literary Monographs series. In that study Bercovitch revealed that the origin of the American Dream rests with the Puritan form of political sermons which celebrated America's special status as the Chosen People of God

by constantly warning them of their failure to live up to their promise.[28] Bercovitch has just provided a major revision and expansion of his 1970 monograph which has been published in book form under the title: The American Jeremiad. In this work he shows that as a rhetorical form the jeremiad became a vehicle of cultural expression, an agent of socialization through the nineteenth century and even into our own times. He deals with the jeremiad as rhetoric, as ideology, and as ritual. At the risk of sounding like a prophet myself, I would venture the prediction that this book will have a profound impact upon the study of American public discourse during the coming decade. I think that I can best communicate the sweeping vision of this extraordinary work by simply sharing with you the opening paragraph of Bercovitch's preface: "Rhetoric functions within a culture. It reflects and affects a set of particular psychic, social, and historical needs. This is conspicuously true of the American jeremiad, a mode of public exhortation that originated in the European pulpit, was transformed in both form and content by the New England Puritans, persisted through the eighteenth century, and helped sustain a national dream through two hundred years of turbulence and change. The American jeremiad was a ritual designed to join social criticism to spiritual renewal, public to private identity, the shifting 'signs of the times' to certain traditional metaphors, themes, and symbols."[29]

The jeremiad begins with the assumption that Americans are a chosen people, that the American land is a promised land.[30] As this rhetorical form has endured over 300 years, it has taken on a secular cast, so that modern Jeremiahs do not warn us that we are falling away from our covenant with God, but rather that we are falling away from our covenant with the American past and that we are thereby endangering or delaying the comsummation of the American Dream. In observing the political rhetoric of the early 1950s Perry Miller noted that "we hear much talk nowadays about corruption,

most of it couched in generalized terms. If we ask our current Jeremiahs to descend to particulars, they tell us that the republic is going on the rocks, or to the dogs, because the wives of politicians aspire to wear mink coats and their husbands take a moderate five percent cut on certain deals to pay for the garments." The assumption of the modern political jeremiad, Miller commented, is that "regeneration would be accomplished at the next election by turning the rascals out!"[31] In short, the American civil religion which Robert Bellah has so ably described has replaced the Puritan's religion as the underpinning of the jeremiad, but the form continues in our national rhetoric.[32]

Whether sacred or secular, the jeremiad performs two essential functions within the rhetoric of a movement. First, it provides a link between the past and the future. Second, it helps to create a sense of community. By enjoining Americans to live up to the obligations inherited from their past, jeremiahs are able to control perceptions of the future even as they reinterpret the meaning of the past. It is easy to dismiss the American civil religion (and the jeremiad, which is its principal rhetorical form) as "hypocracy agreed to," as a sham in which political leaders participate for the convenience of smooth social control. In fact, Roderick Hart seems to do something of this sort in his recent monograph, The Political Pulpit.[33] To do so, however, is to ignore the very real need that a people have to place themselves in history--to know from whence they came and to know where they are going. As Perry Miller has noted, "the jeremiads came from something deeper than pious fraud, [something] more profound than cant: they were the voice of a community bespeaking its apprehensions about itself."[34] As jeremiads bridged the past and the future, they helped in the creation of a national identity and, ultimately, in a sense of national mission which united the community. It was this very quality of the jeremiad that most fascinated

to regain God's support through repentance. Francis Hopkinson's remarks upon the "Continental Fast" of 1775 are instructive here. He reviewed the whole sweep of American history in a few sentences and then stated: "At length it pleased heaven to permit the hand of oppression to be stretched out against us; . . . the horrors of war are let loose against us . . . . Our land is drenched with the blood of its inhabitants: and the hand of industry lies festering on that soil it was wont to cultivate." Hopkinson then explains: "How exceedingly solemn is the idea of the thousands and ten thousands [of] inhabitants of a country eighteen hundred miles in extent united in one important cause,at one and the same time, suspending all their various occupations of life, and at one and the same time fasting and prayer prostrating themselves before the God of their worship."[38] As the movement reached the crisis period with a formal Declaration of Independence, the Revolutionary Jeremiahs shifted to an emphasis on action, calling upon Americans to demonstrate their faith by taking up arms and resisting the tyrants. When success seemed assured, the ministers were joined by a host of secular orators in celebrating the lifting of the punishment of war and in predicting the glorious future of the New Jerusalem.

It is important to remember that "movements" do "move." They progress at least in part because of the actions and the rhetoric of the men and women leading the movement. By viewing the rhetoric of the American Revolution through the structure of the jeremiad, it is easier to spot those speakers who were at the advancing edge of the movement--those, for example, who started to stress action (or a plan for redemption) when most of their contemporaries were still speaking in terms of lamentation. John Hancock is an interesting case in point. In March of 1774 he reassured his audience

at the fourth annual commemoration of the Boston Massacre that they had recognized their sins; now they had to act: "I have the most animating confidence," Hancock asserted, "that the present noble struggle for liberty will terminate gloriously for America . . . ; let us humbly commit our righteous cause to the great Lord of the universe, who loveth righteousness, and hateth iniquity--and having secured the approbation of our hearts, . . . let us joyfully leave her important concerns in the hands of him who raiseth up and putteth down the empires and kingdoms of the world as He pleases." But faith and prayer were not enough; Hancock urged: "By all that is dear, by all that is sacred, not only that ye pray, but that you act; that if necessary, ye fight, and even die for the prosperity of our Jerusalem." In short, Hancock called upon Americans to "play the man for our God."[39] Through this sort of nudging and prodding, rhetors pushed their auditors further down the path of the jeremiad until they had moved from resistance to revolt.

The jeremiad, of course, also left Americans with a terrible burden. Having won the Revolution, they then had to fulfill the prophecy of a New Jerusalem. This unending task has occupied us for over 200 years. It was Dr. Benjamin Rush who remarked that the end of the Revolutionary War was not the end of the American revolution: "On the contrary, nothing but the first act of the great drama is closed. It remains yet," he observed, "to establish and perfect our new forms of government and to prepare the principles, morals, and manners of our citizens for these forms of government after they are established and brought to perfection."[40] This goal of "perfection" has spawned a seemingly unending series of reform movements in American--movements whose rhetoric might be profitably examined through the framework provided by a uniquely American significant form: the American jeremiad.

NOTES

[1]Leland M. Griffin, "The Rhetoric of Historical Movements," QJS, 38 (April 1952), 184-188.

[2]Herbert W. Simons, "Requirements, Problems, and Strategies: A Theory of Persuasion for Social Movements," QJS, 56 (February 1970), 1-11.

[3]Ralph R. Smith and Russel R. Windes, "The Innovational Movement: A Rhetorical Theory," QJS, 61 (April 1975), 140-154.

[4]Robert S. Cathcart, "New Approaches to the Study of Movements: Defining Movements Rhetorically," Western Speech 36 (Spring 1972), 82-88.

[5]Spectra, 11 (August 1975), 6.

[6]John H. Patton, "Generic Criticism: Typology at an Inflated Price," Rhetoric Society Quarterly, 6 (Winter 1976), 4. Curiously, the leading advocates of "genre criticism" have failed to reply to Patton's cogent criticisms.

[7]Thomas Conley, "Review of Form and Genre: Shaping Rhetorical Action," in Communication Quarterly, 26 (Fall 1978), 71-75.

[8]Karlyn Kohrs Campbell and Kathleen Hall Jamieson, "Form and Genre in Rhetorical Criticism: An Introduction," in Form and Genre: Shaping Rhetorical Action, eds. Karlyn Kohrs Campbell and Kathleen Hall Jamieson (Falls Church, VA: Speech Communication Association, 1978), p. 20.

[9]Henry Nash Smith, Virgin Land (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1950), p. vii.

[10]This is particularly true in Ernest Bormann's essay, "Rhetorical Criticism and Significant Form: A Humanistic Approach," in Form and Genre; Shaping Rhetorical Action, esp. p. 174.

[11]Ibid., p. 165.

[12]Charles J. Stewart, "Transforming Reality: The Primary Rhetorical Function of Social Movements," a presentation at the 1979 Memphis State University Undergraduate Honors Conference in Communication Arts and Sciences.

[13]See Michael McGee, "In Search of 'The People': A Rhetorical Alternative," QJS, 61 (October 1975), 235-249.

[14]Campbell and Jamieson, "Form and Genre in Rhetorical Criticism," p. 14.

[15]James R. Andrews, "The Passionate Negation: The Chartist Movement in Rhetorical Perspective," QJS, 59 (April 1973), 198.

[24]William Gribbin, "The Covenant Transformed: The Jeremiad Tradition and the War of 1812," Church History, 40 (1971), 297-305. I should note that both Gribbin and Berens are exceptions to the generalization that the jeremiad has been studied primarily by literary critics, for they both have their academic homes in university departments of history.

[25]Bormann, "Fetching Good Out of Evil," pp. 134-139.

[26]Ronald H. Carpenter, "The Historical Jeremiad as Rhetorical Genre," in Form and Genre: Shaping Rhetorical Action, pp. 103-117. For discussions of historical writing as rhetoric, see the following essays by Carpenter: "Frederick Jackson Turner and the Rhetorical Impact of the Frontier Thesis," QJS, 63 (April 1977), 117-129; "The Rhetorical Genesis of Style in the 'Frontier Hypothesis' of Frederick Jackson Turner," Southern Speech Journal, 37 (Spring 1972), 233-248; and "Alfred Thayer Mahan's Style on Sea Power: A Paramessage Conducing to Ethos," Speech Monographs (August 1975), 190-202.

[27]Ritter, "Contemporary Politics and History: The Uses of the Past in Campaign Persuasion."

[28]Sacvan Bercovitch, "Horologicals to Chronometricals: The Rhetoric of the Jeremiad," in Literary Monographs, III, ed. Eric Rothstein (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1970), p. 90.

[29]Sacvan Bercovitch, The American Jeremiad (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1978), p. xi. Also see the following essays by Berchovitch: "The Typology of America's Mission," American Quarterly, 30 (Summer 1978), 135-155; "How the Puritans Won the American Revolution," Massachusetts Review, 17 (1976), 597-630; and "The Image of America: From Hermeneutics to Symbolism," Bucknell Review, 20 (1972), 3-12.

[30]For in depth discussions of the significance of religion in the development of an American identity, see Sacvan Bercovitch, The Puritan Origins of the American Self (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1975). The ties between religion and early American discourse are far clearer when the modern reader has an appreciation of the typological method of Biblical exegesis practiced by the New England Puritans. In this connection, see Sacvan Bercovitch, ed., Typology and Early American Literature (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1972).

[31]Miller, Errand into the Wilderness, p. 7.

[32]See Robert N. Bellah, "Civil Religion in America," Daedalus, 96 (Winter 1967), 1-21; Robert H. Bellah, The Broken Covenant: American Civil Religion in Time of Trial (New York: Seabury Press, 1975); Russell E. Richey and Donald G. Jones, eds., American Civil Religion (New York: Harper & Row, 1974; and Sidney E. Mead, The Nation With the Soul of a Church (New York: Harper & Row, 1975). For a convenient anthology of primary documents and critical essays, see Winthrop S. Hudson, ed., Nationalism and Religion in America: Concepts of American Identity and Mission (New York: Harper & Row, 1970). For a discussion of civil religion and the American Revolution, see Catherine L. Albanese, Sons of the Fathers: The Civil Religion of the American Revolution (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1976).

[16]Bormann, "Rhetorical Criticism and Significant Form," p. 179.

[17]Ibid., p. 178.

[18]I should note that this "progressive" interpretation of the jeremiad is most accurate for the sermons of the eighteenth rather than the seventeenth century. For the evolving pattern of the jeremiad during these periods, see works by Perry Miller and Sacvan Bercovitch cited below. The first paragraph of this section of the present paper is adapted from a previous paper by the author: Kurt W. Ritter, "Contemporary Politics and History: The Uses of the Past in Campaign Persuasion," a paper presented at Indiana University's Conference on the Rhetoric of Contemporary Political Campaigning: A Symposium Honoring J. Jeffery Auer, Bloomington, Indiana, April 1, 1978.

[19]Perry Miller, The New England Mind: From Colony to Providence (Cambridge: Harvard University, 1953). In a sense, the jeremiad is an organizing principle in this volume; it is discussed in most detail, however, in pp. 27-39. Also see Perry Miller, Errand into the Wilderness (1956; rpt. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1964), pp. 1-15; and Perry Miller, "From the Covenant to the Revival," in Religion in American Life, I: The Shaping of American Religion, eds. James Ward Smith and A. LeLand Jamison (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1961), pp. 322-368.

[20]David Minter, "The Puritan Jeremiad as a Literary Form," in The American Puritan Imagination: Essays in Revaluation, ed. Sacvan Bercovitch (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1974), p. 222, n. 16.

[21]John F. Berens, Providence & Patriotism in Early America, 1640-1815 (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1978), pp. 26-27.

[22]Berens, Providence & Patriotism, pp. 34-43; Barbara A. Larson, Prologue to Revolution: The War Sermons of the Reverend Samuel Davies--A Rhetorical Study (Falls Church, VA: Speech Communication Association, 1978). Bormann interprets Larson's study so as to make the jeremiadic quality of Davies' sermons more central to a reading of them; see: Ernest Bormann, "Fetching Good Out of Evil: A Rhetorical Use of Calamity," QJS, 63 (April 1977), 133.

[23]Berens, Providence & Patriotism, pp. 58-60, 85-88. On this topic, Perry Miller's essay probably remains the best study, although Bercovitch has revised Miller's conclusions in some important ways; see Perry Miller, "From the Covenant to the Revival." Although not self-consciously concerned with the jeremiad as a significant rhetorical form, the following essays present careful studies of sermons in the jeremiad tradition during (and before and after) the American Revolution: Harry P. Kerr, "The Election Sermon: Primer for Revolutionaries," Speech Monographs, 29 (March 1962), 13-22; Harry P. Kerr, "Politics and Religion in Colonial Fast and Thanksgiving Sermons, 1763-1783," QJS, 47 (December 1960), 372-383; Harold D. Mixon, "Boston's Artillery Election Sermons and the American Revolution," Speech Monographs, 35 (March 1967), 43-50; and Wayne Minnick," The New England Execution Sermons, 1639-1800, "Speech Monographs, 35 (March 1968), 77-89. For a more recent study of the execution sermon as a jeremiad, see Ronald A. Bosco, "Lectures at the Pillory: The Early American Execution Sermon," American Quarterly, 30 (Summer 1978), 156-176. Neither Minnick's nor Boscoe's study deals with the American Revolution in any direct way.

[24]William Gribbin, "The Covenant Transformed: The Jeremiad Tradition and the War of 1812," Church History, 40 (1971), 297-305. I should note that both Gribbin and Berens are exceptions to the generalization that the jeremiad has been studied primarily by literary critics, for they both have their academic homes in university departments of history.

[25]Bormann, "Fetching Good Out of Evil," pp. 134-139.

[26]Ronald H. Carpenter, "The Historical Jeremiad as Rhetorical Genre," in Form and Genre: Shaping Rhetorical Action, pp. 103-117. For discussions of historical writing as rhetoric, see the following essays by Carpenter: "Frederick Jackson Turner and the Rhetorical Impact of the Frontier Thesis," QJS, 63 (April 1977), 117-129; "The Rhetorical Genesis of Style in the 'Frontier Hypothesis' of Frederick Jackson Turner," Southern Speech Journal, 37 (Spring 1972), 233-248; and "Alfred Thayer Mahan's Style on Sea Power: A Paramessage Conducing to Ethos," Speech Monographs (August 1975), 190-202.

[27]Ritter, "Contemporary Politics and History: The Uses of the Past in Campaign Persuasion."

[28]Sacvan Bercovitch, "Horologicals to Chronometricals: The Rhetoric of the Jeremiad," in Literary Monographs, III, ed. Eric Rothstein (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1970), p. 90.

[29]Sacvan Bercovitch, The American Jeremiad (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1978), p. xi. Also see the following essays by Berchovitch: "The Typology of America's Mission," American Quarterly, 30 (Summer 1978), 135-155; "How the Puritans Won the American Revolution," Massachusetts Review, 17 (1976), 597-630; and "The Image of America: From Hermeneutics to Symbolism," Bucknell Review, 20 (1972), 3-12.

[30]For in depth discussions of the significance of religion in the development of an American identity, see Sacvan Bercovitch, The Puritan Origins of the American Self (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1975). The ties between religion and early American discourse are far clearer when the modern reader has an appreciation of the typological method of Biblical exegesis practiced by the New England Puritans. In this connection, see Sacvan Bercovitch, ed., Typology and Early American Literature (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1972).

[31]Miller, Errand into the Wilderness, p. 7.

[32]See Robert N. Bellah, "Civil Religion in America," Daedalus, 96 (Winter 1967), 1-21; Robert H. Bellah, The Broken Covenant: American Civil Religion in Time of Trial (New York: Seabury Press, 1975); Russell E. Richey and Donald G. Jones, eds., American Civil Religion (New York: Harper & Row, 1974; and Sidney E. Mead, The Nation With the Soul of a Church (New York: Harper & Row, 1975). For a convenient anthology of primary documents and critical essays, see Winthrop S. Hudson, ed., Nationalism and Religion in America: Concepts of American Identity and Mission (New York: Harper & Row, 1970). For a discussion of civil religion and the American Revolution, see Catherine L. Albanese, Sons of the Fathers: The Civil Religion of the American Revolution (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1976).

[33]Roderick Hart, The Political Pulpit (West Lafayette, Ind.: Purdue Univeristy Press, 1977), especially chapters 3 and 4. In this regard, it might be useful to recall Perry Miller's reaction to cynics who treated the jeremiad as "only a clever device in propoganda." Such an evaluation, Miller noted is "as much a commentary on the mentality of modern sociology" as upon the motives at those who used religious appeals. See Miller, "From the Covenant to the Revival," p. 324; also see his related comments on pp. 333, 336, and 343-344.

[34]Miller, The New England Mind, p. 47

[35]Bormann, "Fetching Good Out of Evil," p. 139

[36]Bormann, "Rhetorical Criticism and Significant Form," p. 170

[37]Miller, "From the Covenant to the Revival," p. 346.

[38]Francis Hopkinson, "On the Late Continental Fast," Pennsylvania Magazine (July 1775), pp. 309-310.

[39]John Hancock, "Boston Massacre Oration, (March 5, 1774)," in The Colonial Idiom, eds. David Potter and Gordon L. Thomas (Carbondale, Ill.: Southern Illinois University Press, 1970), pp. 270-271.

[40]Benjamin Rush, "On the Defects of the Confederation," in The Selected Writings of Benjamin Rush, ed. Dagobert D. Runes (New York: Philosophical Library, 1947), p. 26.